UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,505	06/20/2003	Debra A. Elkins	GP-302248	5477
7590 10/15/2007 General Motors Corporation			EXAMINER	
Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21 300 Renaissance Center P.O. Box 300			KARDOS, NEIL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Detroit, MI 48265-3000			4172	,
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	·	T	1	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/600,505	ELKINS ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Neil R. Kardos	4172	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
V - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RINGLED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RINGLED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RINGLED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RINGLED STATE STAT	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	TION. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 Ju</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar	action is non-final.	osecution as to the merits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5) 6) 7)	Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	wn from consideration.	•	
Applicati	ion Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2.	epted or b) objected to by the Idrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)[_ a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte	

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-9, drawn to identifying and ranking property risks by determining production opportunities and limitations, classified in class 705, subclass 10.
 - II. Claims 10-21, drawn to analyzing and mitigating risk based on organizational structure, contribution margins, and strategic decisions, classified in class 705, subclass 7.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as quantifying property risks (no evaluation of organizational structure and interconnectivity as per Invention II). Subcombination II has separate utility such as improving management of disruptions to normal business operations by mitigating risk (no analysis of manufacturing and production systems as per Invention I). See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the

Art Unit: 4172

present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil R. Kardos whose telephone number is (571) 270-3443. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu and alternating Fridays from 7:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dixon can be reached on (571) 272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Neil R. Kardos

Examiner

Art Unit 4172

nrk

October 10, 2007